DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 252 JC 900 206

TITLE	California Community College Accountability Model.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE	Apr 90
NOTE	30p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Access to Education; Accountability; Accreditation (Institutions); *Affirmative Action; *Community Colleges; *Educational Assessment; Financial Policy; Fiscal Capacity; Models; *Outcomes of Education; Participant Satisfaction; School Personnel; Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

In 1990, the California Community Colleges Assembly Bill 1725 (AB 1725) Accountability Task Force created an accountability model to provide information which would facilitate the assessment of community colleges' educational and fiscal effectiveness. The model contains five major components and indicators of effectiveness for each: (1) student access, measured in terms student enrollment and participation rates; programs to promote educational access, such as financial aid, basic skills, and articulation programs; and physical facilities; (2) student success, measured in terms of academic standards, course completions, student goal achievement, basic skills and English as Second Language course preparation assessment, non-credit adult education, and accreditation standards; (3) student satisfaction, assessed by surveys of students and accreditation reports on student services and learning resources; (4) staff composition reflective of California's population in terms of ethnicity, gender, age, and disability; and (5) fiscal condition, involving comprehensive reporting on revenues and expenditures, resource allocation, costs per student, program-based funding, and other financial matters. Appendixes include a discussion of accountability elements in AB 1725, a list of groups represented on the task force, and sample reporting forms. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED317252

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ACCOUNTABILITY MODEL

Prepared by

California Community Colleges

AB 1725 Accountability Task Force

Prepared for

California Community College

Chancellor's Office

JC 900 206

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

April, 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 2

Accountability Model Overview 4

Uses of the Model 5

Implementation of the Model 6

Component 1 - Student Access 8

Component 2 - Student Success 11

Component 3 - Student Satisfaction 14

Component 4 - Staff Compostion 15

Component 5 - Fiscal Condition 16

Appendix A - AB 1725 Accountability Elements 19

Appendix B - Groups Represented on Task Force, Membership, Process 20

Appendix C - Sample of Information Provided at Levels 1-3 22

Appendix D - Sample Formats for Completion Rate Data 26

California Community College Accountability Model

I. INTRODUCTION

Accountability has become, in recent years, a central focus within the public sector of higher education. Numerous state legislatures, executive officers, governing boards, educators, and community representatives have become interested in the concept. In fact, a 1989 survey for the National Governors Association found that 36 states had implemented or were considering implementing some form of accountability system.

In 1988, the California Legislature passed AB 1725, specifying that by July 1, 1990, the Board of Governors (BOG) will take steps to implement a comprehensive community college accountability system over a three-year period commencing by the 1991-92 academic year. (See Appendix A for a list of accountability requirements identified in AB 1725.)

This report, prepared by the California Community Colleges AB 1725 Accountability Task Force, proposes such a model. The intent of this model is to provide the colleges and districts, Board of Governors and legislature with information that will allow for the continued improvement of student learning and success.

A. Accountability Defined

A dictionary definition of accountability is "the condition of being held responsible for one's obligation."

Two important aspects of accountability in the public higher education domains are:

1. specifying one's obligation; and
2. remaining answerable for the discharge of that obligation

The first aspect is concerned with illuminating expectations while the second suggests communication of evidence to demonstrate the fulfillment of one's obligation.

Various laws, regulations, rules, guidelines, missions, goals and objectives exist at the state and local levels which describe the obligations of the California community college system and the local

districts in providing postsecondary education opportunities to the citizens of the State. This model is concerned with the reporting of evidence demonstrating the community college system's institutional effectiveness in the discharge of its postsecondary education obligation.

Therefore, for the purpose of this model, accountability is operationally demonstrated by:

> The reporting of evidence which measures the California community college system's performance of its postsecondary education obligation to the people of the State.

B. Model Development

California Education Code Section 71020.5, as enacted by AB 1725, provided the framework for work on an accountability model. This section indicated that "the Board of Governors shall develop and implement a comprehensive community college educational and fiscal accountability system." Additional language in the Code indicated that "the chancellor shall provide a written report to the legislature and Governor on or before July 1, 1990."

In order to implement these changes, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges established an Accountability Task Force comprised of 31 members. (See Appendix B.)

C. Present Accountability Mechanisms

Numerous accountability mechanisms exist for California's community colleges at the present time. These mechanisms exist at the system, district and individual college levels. The mechanisms generally emanate from the results of such diverse activities as compliance reviews, fiscal audits, program reviews and accreditation reports.

This significant amount of accountability activity provides the foundation for this model. The components of this model build upon existing mechanisms, and developing ones such as the Management Information System (MIS), while adding some new dimensions to accountability. The comprehensive model contained in this report will replace some of the existing systems in order to eliminate duplication and, more importantly, provide for the reporting of vital accountability resources in a single model.

II. ACCOUNTABILITY MODEL OVERVIEW

A. Purpose

The primary purpose of this accountability model is to provide information which will allow assessment of community college educational and fiscal effectiveness. The underlying goal of this model is "to improve educational quality" [ECS 71020.5(a)]. The ultimate purpose of an accountability system should be to maintain and improve the quality of the institution and enhance the California community colleges.

Information provided by the model should be used by the colleges, districts, chancellor's office, Board of Governors and legislature to enhance the effectiveness of the California community colleges and to develop programs and strategies for the continued enhancement of student success.

B. Principles

The development of a comprehensive accountability system for the California Community Colleges should:

- Reflect different dimensions of accountability appropriate for institutions and the system;
- Assure that measures used to assess student performance are directly related to teaching and learning processes;
- Relate to the mission statements of the system and individual institutions;
- Enhance student learning and development;
- Reflect institutional differences in community and student demographics;
- Rely primarily on institutional self assessment and peer review;
- Promote positive incentives for institutional improvement;
- Relate to ongoing institutional accreditation, planning, evaluation and budget-development activities;
- Insure efficiency in data gathering activities;

- Solicit systemwide consultation in development and implementation;
- Assure the availability of adequate resources for accountability.

C. Scope of the Model

This accountability model contains five major components. These components are: (1) student access, (2) student success, (3) student satisfaction, (4) staff composition and (5) fiscal condition.

AB 1725 requires the model "...to define qualitatively and quantitatively" specific accountability information for each of these five measures. Quantitative measures are generally available through existing reports and the Management Information System (MIS). Qualitative measures are generally available through the WASC* accreditation standards and processes, and may need to be expanded for local reporting needs.

III USES OF THE MODEL

This accountability model should serve as a primary source of information as the system and local districts assess their effectiveness, plan their budgets and develop programs and services.

It is anticipated the model is to be used at three levels.

LEVEL 1: **Annual Systemwide Reporting to the Legislature and Other Appropriate Agencies by the Board of Governors and Chancellor**

LEVEL 2: **Community College Districts Reporting to the Board of Governors and Chancellor**

* Western Association of Schools and Colleges/Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. WASC is one of six regional accrediting agencies recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the U.S. Secretary of Education to provide institutional accreditation. The Accrediting Commission serves two-year colleges in California, Hawaii and the Pacific Islands. Standards are from the 1990 Handbook of Accreditation.

LEVEL 3: Community College Districts and Colleges Reporting to Local Constituencies

In all cases, the information reported at Level 1 is available to constituencies at Levels 2 and 3.

* Level 1

  It is anticipated that at Level 1 the Board of Governors would use the accountability model for their systemwide strategic planning, policy development and budget formulation.

* Level 2

  At this level the local districts and colleges report to the Chancellor's Office for program and compliance reviews, fiscal audits and accreditation reports. It is anticipated that districts will use the information for local strategic planning, policy development and budget formulation.

* Level 3

  It is anticipated that local districts and colleges will also use the model to inform their communities on the progress being made in meeting local educational needs.

* See Appendix C.

IV IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MODEL

A. Field Test of Accountability Model

The 1990-91 Governor's Budget provides $375,000 in local assistance monies for a pilot test of the Accountability Model. The purpose will be to field test the feasibility and usefulness of the proposed accountability model at the local, systemwide and State levels. In addition, the pilot test will provide information on the State-mandated costs for districts and colleges of implementing the accountability model.

During the field testing period, the model should be viewed as dynamic and evolving. Experience with the model, field testing results, and feedback from users and consumers of the model may lead to changes in the model.

B. Obtaining Funds for 1991-92 Statewide Implementation

Statewide implementation of the accountability model is scheduled to begin during the 1991-92 academic year, as required by AB 1725, and implemented over a three-year period. Implementation activity is contingent upon securing funding in the 1991-92 Budget Act. This implementation schedule calls for the use of the Management Information System (MIS) to develop most of the data reports envisioned for the accountability system. Task force members have continually noted the importance of using MIS for accountability-data development, rather than requiring new reporting mechanisms.

COMPONENT 1: STUDENT ACCESS

Equal opportunity for student access to postsecondary education is a vital concern of the state's community college system. This concern has been articulated in AB 1725 and numerous reports issued by such groups as the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), the California Community College Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office, and the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education.

Many factors facilitate or restrict student access to their local colleges. Distances to campus, commuting time, cost of attendance, parking spaces, breadth of curricular offerings, institutional reputation, and services offered are only a small sample of influences affecting student access. At a more pragmatic level, is the influence of funding on access. If districts are at or above cap*, for example, access can be negatively affected. The numbers of courses and sections offered by a college and the minimum class size required to offer a course are affected by funding. These factors do have a considerable impact on increasing or decreasing access.

Given this backdrop, the task force has identified the following elements as indicators of student access.

A. Student Enrollment & Participation Rate

Using multiple year comparative enrollment statistics from MIS data and demographic data, the following list of participation rates are proposed.

1. Gender
2. Age Categories
3. Ethnicity
4. Disability
5. Full-Time, Part-Time and Non-Credit Enrollment Status
6. Average Hour Loads
7. Within District, Out-Of-District, Out-Of-State Enrollment
8. Numbers of Hours Worked By Students Per Week
9. Total Unduplicated Headcount

* Levels of unfunded student enrollment

10. Total Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)
* 11. Enrollment Projections
* 12. Enrollment by Zip Code Aggregated by Income

Enrollment Vs. Cap

1. Number and Percentage of Districts Above CAP
2. Number of Students (FTES) Above CAP

Participation Rates

1. Headcount Enrollment in Credit Courses Compared to Adult Population Aggregated at State Level
2. Headcount Enrollment in Credit Courses Compared to Adult Population Demographic Characteristics (i.e., Gender, Age, Ethnicity, Zip Code Aggregated by Income) Aggregated at State Level
3. Results of CPEC College-Going Rates Study

B. Access Programs

Financial Aid (Annual Reporting)

a. Number and Percentage of Students who Request and receive Financial Aid by Selected Student Characteristics
b. Dollar Amount of Need-Based Aid Provided by Major Aid Category
c. Dollar Amount of Unmet Need

English-As-A-Second-Language (ESL) and Basic Skill Course Offerings (Credit and Non-Credit)

a. Number and Percentage of Students (FTES and Headcount) Enrolled in ESL courses
b. Number and Percentage of Students (FTES and Headcount) Enrolled in Basic Skills Courses

* From census or other population data

Categorical Programs Designed to Increase Student Access (e.g. EOPS, DSPS, GAIN, Matriculation)

a. Listing and Description of Special Categorical Programs Offered to Increase Student Access
b. Number of Students (Headcount) Using Program Services

Articulation

a. Number and type (system, school, program and course) of Articulation Agreements with Secondary Schools and with Four-Year Institutions
b. Qualitative Measure - WASC Accreditation Standard 2C: Articulation

C. Physical Facilities

Facilities

a. Amount of Dollars Spent on Physical Facility Improvements For Handicapped Student Access Versus Dollars Needed
b. Qualitative Measure - WASC Accreditation Standard 6A: Facilities

Additional student access indicators should be investigated for inclusion in the model. The use of census data, outreach and recruitment activities, periodic statewide survey of students' social/economic status, facility needs based on revised utilization standards, program based funding standards as they influence average class size and class size minimums, number of class sections canceled due to enrollments below minimum standards, and numbers of secondary school graduates eligible and not eligible for UC and CSU enrollment who enroll in community colleges may later be considered feasible and appropriate to include within this Student Access Component of the Accountability Model.

COMPONENT 2: STUDENT SUCCESS

The success of students is the foremost goal of faculty and staff of the California community colleges. The concept of student success is complex. Institutional efforts to help students learn are but one side of the equation. Student preparation, motivation, responsibility, involvement, readiness, and effort are also pertinent factors which influence student success. The road to success is a shared journey by colleges and students. Historically, outcome measures of student success usually involve institutional commitment only.

Elements within this component do contain indicators of institutional and, to a lesser extent, student commitment and effort to success in the community college educational experience.

A. Academic Standards

1. Number and Percentage of Existing Courses Meeting Title V Requirements Reviewed and Revised
2. Number of New Courses Meeting Title V Requirements
3. Qualitative Measure - Statement of Curriculum Committee Involvement in Course Approval and Revision Process
4. Qualitative Measure - Narrative Description of Program Review Activities
5. Qualitative Measure - WASC Accreditation
   - Standard 2B: General Education
   - Standard 2D: Curriculum Planning and Evaluation
   - Standard 2E: Non-Credit Courses and Programs
   - Standard 2G: Credit for Student Achievement

B. Course Completions (Excludes "F," "W" and No-Credit)

* 1. Completion Rates of Students (Headcount) by Discipline and Credit Level From First Census to Receipt of a Final Grade (Transfer/General Education, Vocational/Technical, Precollegiate Basic Skills, etc.)

* 2. Completion Rates of Students by Title V Course Level

* See Sample Format in Appendix D.

C. Student Goal Achievement (From Matriculation Process)

* 1. Transfer Goal

a. Number and Percentage of Students Identifying "Transfer" as a Matriculation Goal
b. Number of Students Who Transfer to a Senior Institution
c. Transfer Rate for "Probable Transfer Students"
d. GPAs of Transfer Students at Senior Institutions After One Semester and After One Year
e. Number and Percentage of Transfer Students Completing Precollegiate Courses
f. Number and Percentage of Students Transferring to Another California Community College
g. Number and Percentage of Transfer Students Completing Baccalaureate Degrees

** 2. Vocational Preparation Goal

a. Number and Percentage of Students Identifying "Vocational Preparation" as a Matriculation Goal
b. Number and Percentage of Students Completing a Certificate or Degree
c. Employment Status of Program Completers and Non-Completers (Number and Percentage)
d. College Attendance Status of Program Completers and Non-Completers (Number and Percentage)
e. Employment Status Relationship to Training For Program Completers and Non-Completers (Number and Percentage)
f. Pass Rate of Completers on Licensing and Accrediting Examination by Vocational/Technical Program
g. Degree of Employer Satisfaction With Preparation of Program Completer
h. A-E Categorized by Student Characteristics

* It is suggested by the Task Force that a number of transfer rate formulas be evaluated as part of the accountability model field test.

** Elements a, b, c, d, e, g, and h derived from the Statewide Student Follow-up System

3. Personal Development Goals

   a. Number and Percentage of Students (FTES and Headcount) Meeting Selected Goals Identified in the Matriculation Process
   b. Number and Percentage of Students (FTES and Headcount) Meeting Selected Goals Identified in Matriculation Process by Student Demographic Characteristics (i.e., Age, Gender, Ethnicity)

D. Basic Skills and ESL Course Preparation Assessment

   a. Number, Percentage, GPA and Completion Rates of Basic Skills Students, ESL Students, Direct Entry Students and Total by Academic Standard Classification and Student Characteristics

E. Non-Credit (Adult Education)

   a. Number and percentage of students enrolled in the nine authorized instruction areas.
   b. Number and percentage of students enrolled in the nine authorized instruction areas by student demographic characteristics
   c. Qualitative Measure - WASC Accreditation Standard 2E Non-Credit Courses and Programs

F. Qualitative Measure - WASC Accreditation Report For the Following Standards

1. Standard 1: Institutional Integrity, Purposes, Planning and Effectiveness
   - 1C: Institutional Planning
   - 1D: Institutional Effectiveness

2. Standard 2: Educational Programs
   - 2A: General Requirements

It is assumed the responsibility for the establishment of an effective intersegmental tracking system rests with CPEC working in cooperation with the education segments within the state.

COMPONENT 3: STUDENT SATISFACTION

An essential measure of institutional effectiveness is the student's level of satisfaction as consumers of educational programs and services.

Since community colleges in California are locally based institutions under local governance and the consumers are local citizens who generally continue to reside in the local community upon completion of their education, their satisfaction is important to continued support for the local community colleges.

The elements in this component focus on student goal satisfaction measures and qualitative results of accreditation visits.

A. Student Satisfaction Surveys

1. Satisfaction with progress toward obtaining educational goal
2. Satisfaction with processes and services used to achieve goal, i.e.:
   - a. Instruction
   - b. Instructional Services
   - c. Student Services
   - d. Facilities
   - e. Governance/Administration

B. Qualitative Measure - WASC Accreditation Report

Standard 3: Student Services and the Co-Curricular Learning Environment
- 3A: General Provisions
- 3B: Counseling Services
- 3C: Admissions and Records
- 3D: Coordination and Administration
- 3E: Comprehensiveness of Services

Standard 5: Learning Resources
- 5A: General Provisions
- 5C: Accessibility

It is anticipated that a standard statewide survey will be administered to a representative sample of community college students measuring satisfaction with the major elements identified in A.

It is anticipated that local districts will add additional questions and utilize other sources for Level 2 and Level 3 reporting.

COMPONENT 4: STAFF COMPOSITION

Enhancing the diversity of community college staffs is important especially in light of the rapidly changing demographic characteristics of California's population. Statewide hiring results need to be put into proper perspective by considering the numbers and percentages of faculty and staff hired within each of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, Section 6, (EEO-6) job categories by ethnicity, gender, age and disability compared with the general availability of these groups in the relevant work force having requisite skills to fill vacancies.

Improvement in staff diversity requires not only an intent and commitment, but the proper internal mechanisms and procedures to conduct a search, screen and interview candidates, and negotiate an offer. The results of accreditation visits will provide a qualitative aspect.

A. Numbers & Percentage of Present Staff Compared to Available Work Force in the State by Gender, Age, Disability, and Ethnicity Using EEO-6 Categories

1. Executive - Administrative - Managerial
2. Faculty (Full & Part-Time)
3. Professional Non-Faculty
4. Clerical - Secretarial
5. Service- Maintenance
6. Technical - Para-Professional
7. Skilled Crafts

B. Recent Hires (last 3 years) Compared to Available Work Force in the State by Gender, Age, Disability, and Ethnicity using EEO-6 Categories

C. Accomplishment of Local Affirmative Action Goals & Timetables

Annual progress report toward affirmative action goals and timetables established by local districts reported to the Chancellor's Office.

D. Qualitative Measure - WASC Accreditation Report

Standard 4: Faculty and Staff

COMPONENT 5: FISCAL CONDITION

The Fiscal Condition component contained in this section was constructed to inform the public as to how the community colleges expend their financial resources and the overall fiscal condition of the community college system. It further provides the Board of Governors with fiscal information related to various mandated reporting requirements established by law or regulation.

Currently, the California Community College Chancellor's Office conducts a number of activities related to fiscal accountability. The recently created Fiscal and Program Standards Accountability Unit (F & PSA), comprised of three major accountability areas; (1) Audit Resolution, (2) Vocational Education Act (VEA) Audits, and (2) Student Services Program Compliance Reviews, undertakes major fiscal and program standards compliance accountability activities. This Unit focuses on reviewing accountability in the community college programs of: Vocational Education (VEA), Extended Opportunities Program and Services (EOPS); Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS); and Board Financial Aid Programs (BFAP). This review is accomplished through a three-step procedure of: (1) Field Visit Preparation; (2) Site Visit, and (3) Report Delivery and Resolution.

The Chancellor's Office, further, has a system for monitoring and evaluating the financial conditions of the state's community college districts. This system developed in response to AB 2910, is an early detection and prevention process to "stabilize the financial condition of the district before an emergency appropriation is necessary" (Education Code Section 84046). This charge is accomplished by assessing the financial condition of the districts through the use of various information sources, including a quarterly financial reporting mechanism, and taking appropriate and timely follow-up action to bring about improvement in the district's financial condition. The financial condition of a district is assessed by a review of: (1) General Fund Balance (current, historical and projected); (2) Spending Patterns (current, historical and projected), (3) Average Daily Attendance (ADA) (patterns related to statewide trends and potential impact on revenue); and (4) Other Factors (includes "going concern", as defined by AB 2910, audit citings and internal control audit citings). While a number of instruments and sources of information are used to provide a composite picture of each district's financial condition, the Quarterly Financial Status Report (CCFS-311Q) and the Annual Financial Budget Report (CCFS-311), submitted by each district, are major reporting mechanisms used by the Chancellor's Office. At least one other state agency, the Department of Finance, monitors some aspects of community college financial matters. Currently, the Department of Finance audits about twenty districts a year.

Fiscal accountability activities, also, are undertaken by local community college districts on a routine basis. District contracted audits, conducted by an independent auditing firm, are accomplished on a yearly basis. The Annual Audit Guide, prepared

by the California Community College Chancellor's Office, assists local districts to prepare and contract for this independent audit. Audit results, of course, are available for public scrutiny.

This fiscal condition accountability component is a comprehensive reporting of the financial condition of the state's system of community colleges. It includes:

A. Restricted Purpose Revenues and Expenditures

1. Lottery
2. Instructional Equipment
3. Program Equipment
4. Staff Diversity
5. Staff Development
6. Capital Construction
7. Categorical Programs

B. General Revenue

1. Revenue Type
   - a. Apportionment
   - b. Property Tax
   - c. Student Fees
   - d. Earned Interest
   - e. Other

C. Expenditures

1. Expenditure Type
   - a. Professional Staff Salaries (1000)
   - b. Classified Staff Salaries (2000)_
   - c. Fringe Benefits (3000)
   - d. Supplies (4000)
   - e. Contractual Services (5000)
   - f. Capital Outlay (6000)

D. Related Fiscal Measures

1. Measures
   - a. Compliance With 50% Law
   - b. CAP
     - (1) Above CAP

E. District Audit Results (Summary Data)

F. General Fund Balance

1. Number of Districts With a Positive Balance
2. Percentage of Districts With a Positive Balance
3. Percentage of Budget Represented As Fund Balance

G. Aggregate and Average Cost Per FTES Systemwide

H. Program-Based Funding (Percent of Standards Funded This Year)

I. Qualitative Measure- WASC Accreditation
Standard 7: Financial Resources

APPENDIX A

AB 1725 (ECS 710020.5) requires the Board of Governors to develop and recommend (by July 1990) implementation of a comprehensive community college educational and fiscal accountability system. The legislation outlines major elements of the accountability system requested by the Legislature, including quantitative and qualitative measures in the following areas:

A. Student access to community colleges
B. Extent to which the community college student body reflects proportionately the adult population of the state
C. Student transfer rates and programs
D. Academic standards and student achievement
E. Student goal satisfaction and success in courses and programs
F. Completion rates of courses and programs
G. Occupational preparation relative to state and local work force needs and for entry-level employment, occupational advancement, and career changes of students
H. Adequacy of basic skills and English-as-A- Second Language courses and instruction in preparing students to succeed in collegiate level work
I. Adequacy of and student satisfaction with student services
J. Extent to which the community college work force reflects proportionately the adult population of the state
K. Fiscal conditions of community college districts

APPENDIX B

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

The task force members were representative of the following groups:

Chief executive officers
Chief instructional officers
Chief student services officers
Chief business officers
Chief information system officers
Institutional researchers
Human resource officers
Faculty
Trustees
Accrediting Commission
Chancellor's office

NAMES OF GROUP MEMBERS

Co-Chairpersons:	Jack Carhart, Contra Costa CCD Ted Hamilton, Modesto Junior College
Project Director:	Ray Giles, Rancho Santiago College
Project Consultant:	Bill Piland, San Diego State University
Members:	Martha Kanter, CCC Chancellor's Office Wilfred Desrosiers, College of Marin Cheryl Miller, Citrus CCD Carol McKenzie, Sacramento City College Rod Patterson, Los Angeles John McCuen, CCCT Bob Scannell, Peralta CCD Jan Moser, Palomar College John Woolley, Ventura College Cecil Harrell, Peralta CCD Jim Mitchell, San Francisco CCD Marie Pepicello, San Joaquin Delta College Charlotte Joseph, Long Beach City College Bill Hamre, CCC Chancellor's Office Robert Jensen, Rancho Santiago CCD Bill F. Stewart, State Center CCD Charles K. Sapper, Diablo Valley College

Names of Group Members (continued)

Michael Hill, San Jose/Evergreen CCD
Jake Konen, Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD
Jorge R. Sanchez, Coast CCD
Jim Locke, College of Marin
John Petersen, ACCJC
Marty Hittleman, Los Angeles CCD
Richard Green, Pasadena City College

The AB 1725 Accountability Task Force received its charge from the Chancellor at its initial meeting on November 10, 1989. At that meeting the Task Force divided into three major sub-groups. These groups were organized around accountability issues concerned with the areas of: (1) fiscal; (2) instruction; and (3) student services. The instruction and student services groups further divided into northern and southern contingents. These groups held meetings and conference telephone calls to develop the various model components. The results of their work provided input to the Task Force.

The Accountability Task Force held meetings on December 14, 1989, and January 16, February 13 and April 10, 1990. During this time period, a small writing team was established to take the input of the sub-groups and the Task Force and prepare the actual accountability model. The products provided by the writing team were reviewed and revised by the Task Force.

As the model was being created, Task Force members shared information and received input from the respective constituencies they represented. This sharing of information occurred at statewide and regional meetings of various groups and informal contacts with these constituencies.

Two public hearings were held for the Task Force to receive input from the field. These hearings were conducted at Rancho Santiago College in Santa Ana on March 23, 1990 and at the College of San Mateo in San Mateo on March 30, 1990. The hearings were attended by community college faculty, administrators, support staff, students and other interested parties.

In addition, the accountability model was introduced into the Chancellor's consultation process including review by the following councils: Chief Executive Officers; Academic Senate; Student Body Government; Instructional Officers; Student Services Officers; Business Officers and the Council of Organizations. The representatives of these councils shared the model with their respective groups and provided feedback to the Chancellor.

APPENDIX C

LEVEL 1: CHANCELLOR TO LEGISLATURE/OTHER AGENCIES

A. Restricted Purpose Revenues and Expenditures

Year _____

Revenue Type Amount		Total Revenue Amount	Total Expenditure
1.	Lottery		
2.	Instructional Equipment		
3.	Program Equipment		
4.	Staff Diversity		
5.	Staff Development		
6.	Capital Construction		
7.	Categorical Programs	_____	_____
	TOTALS:		

B. GENERAL REVENUE

Year ____

REVENUE TYPE	**TOTAL REVENUE RECEIVED**
1. Apportionment	
2. Property Tax	
3. Student Fees	
4. Earned Interest	
5. Other	_____
TOTAL:	

C. EXPENDITURES

Year _____

EXPENDITURE TYPE	**TOTAL EXPENDITURES**
1. Professional Staff Salaries (1000)	
2. Classified Staff Salaries (2000)	
3. Fringe Benefits (3000)	
4. Supplies (4000)	
5. Contractual Services (5000)	
6. Capital Outlay (6000)	_____
TOTAL:	

D. RELATED FISCAL MEASURES

Year _____

MEASURES	NO. OF DISTRICTS	% OF DISTRICTS
1. Compliance With the 50% Las		
2. CAP		
a. Above CAP		

E. DISTRICT AUDIT RESULTS (SUMMARY DATA)

F. GENERAL FUND BALANCE*

Year _____

NO. OF DISTRICTS WITH POSITIVE BALANCE BALANCE	% OF DISTRICTS WITH POSITIVE BALANCE	% OF BUDGET REPRESENTED AS FUND

* General fund balance as defined by fiscal monitoring system (AB 2810, Ed. Code 84046)

G. AGGREGATE AND AVERAGE COST PER FTES SYSTEMWIDE*

These figures are derived by calculating total costs of education for the community college system. This figure then is divided by the system total FTES to produce an average cost per FTES.

LEVEL 2: DISTRICT TO CHANCELLOR

A. Examples of Data Reported to Meet Requirements of the Chancellor's Office

1. Fiscal Report (e.g. 311, Quarterly and Annually)
2. Student Attendance Accounting Reporting (e.g. 320)
3. Audit Financial Reports
4. Categorical Data Reports
5. Staff Data Reports

B. Examples of Information Districts May Want to Provide to the Chancellor's Office

1. Cost of Accountability
2. Statement of Special Situations Impacting Fiscal Conditions of Individual Districts (i.e., Size, Location, Campus(e) Age, Student Population Mix, Educational Program Mix, etc.)

LEVEL 3: DISTRICT TO LOCAL CONSTITUENCIES

A. Examples of Important Information to Report

1. Financial Statement for the District (narrative form)
2. Revenue Mix (amounts and percentage)
3. Ending Balances by Fund
4. Budget and Actual Revenue and Expense Comparisons by Major Categories (restricted and non-restricted)

B. Examples of Desirable Information to Report

1. Student Costs to Attend District
2. Fiscal Data to Facilitate Collective Bargaining
3. District Financial Procedures

---

* Credit and non-credit considerations should be discussed in the consultation process since some districts conduct non-credit educational experiences while others do not.

APPENDIX D1

Sample Format

PERCENT COMPLETION RATES BY DISCIPLINE AND STUDENT TYPE

	Precollegiate Basic Skills	English-As-A Second language	Direct Entry	AA Students
Business				
Engineering				
Health Sciences				
Humanities				

APPENDIX D2

Sample Format

PERCENT COMPLETION RATES
by
ACADEMIC STANDARD CLASSIFICATION AND DISCIPLINE

	Business	Engineering	Health Sciences	Humanities
Baccalaureate Degree-Applicable (Transferable Credit Course)				
AA/AS Degree-Applicable (Non-Transferable Credit Course)				
Non-Degree Applicable (Credit Course)				
Non-Credit				

APPENDIX D3

Sample Format

PERCENT COMPLETION RATES BY ACADEMIC STANDARD CLASSIFICATION AND STUDENT TYPE

	Precollegiate Basic Skills	English-As-A Second language	Direct Entry	ALL Students
Baccalaureate Degree-Applicable (Transferable Credit Course)				
AA/AS Degree-Applicable (Non-Transferable Credit Course)				
Non-Degree Applicable (Credit Course)				
Non-Credit				

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
MAY 17 1990